



Your Breakfast Room Made Comfortable With Fuel Supplied the Night Before

Cole's Hot Blast Heater maintains a continuous fire—also a steady even heat. It will hold fire from Saturday night until Monday morning (48 hours) without attention. It will hold fire over night with less coal than any other stove. Open the drafts in the morning and the rooms are quickly heated with the fuel put in the night before. No other stove does this. Burns Soft Coal, Slack, Siftings, Hard Coal or Lignite. One ton of either kind of fuel goes further and gives you more comfort than two tons, using any other kind or make of stove.

Your attention is called to the unparalleled statement made by the manufacturer of

Cole's Hot Blast Heating Stove

"For several years we have authorized our Agents to sell Cole's Original Hot Blast Heater on the guarantee as follows:

- "1—A saving of one-third in fuel over any lower draft stove of the same size, with soft coal, slack or lignite.
 - "2—That Cole's Hot Blast will use less hard coal for heating a given space than any base burner made with the same size fire pot.
 - "3—That the rooms can be heated from one to two hours each morning with the soft coal or hard coal put in the stove the evening before.
 - "4—That the stove will hold fire with soft coal from Saturday night until Monday morning.
 - "5—A uniform heat day and night, with soft coal, hard coal or lignite.
 - "6—That every stove will remain absolutely air-tight as long as used.
 - "7—That the feed-door is and will remain smoke and dust-proof.
 - "8—That the Anti-Puffing Draft will prevent puffing.
- "All we ask is that the stove shall be operated according to directions and connected with a good flue."
"Signed" COLE MANUFACTURING CO., Not Inc.
(Makers of the Original Patented Hot Blast Stove.)

This remarkable guarantee from the makers of this stove should be of interest to you if you contemplate buying a heating stove.

Years of use has proven that no heater—at twice the price—equals it for radiating heat, for holding fire, requiring so little attention, never giving trouble, and cutting down your coal bill one-third to one-half.

Come in and examine Cole's Original Hot Blast which is now imitated by nearly every other stove manufacturer. Price \$12.00 and upward, according to size.

No other
Heater
Nearly
as Good.

LOPEZ STORE CO., IRONTON, MO.

Five
Original
Patented
Features
Make it a
Fuel Saver.

State-Wide Prohibition.

Facts about the Recent Maine Election. What "Fighting Bob" Evans thinks about it. Views of Dr. William Preston Hill.

When the State of Maine, after being continuously Republican in State matters for thirty years and in National elections for more than fifty years, went Democratic at the recent election, September 12, 1910, the strongest deciding factor was the prohibition issue.

This was largely the issue on which the Democratic party made its fight. The Republican party in Maine stood for strict laws preventing the sale of liquor and other rigid laws for their enforcement over the heads of local officials.

The Democratic party asserted that prohibition was both a failure and a farce; that under it the surreptitious sale of liquors had increased to an enormous extent; that arrests for selling liquor and for drunkenness had continuously increased; that "blind tigers" and dives had multiplied; that a large share of the traffic had been driven from the saloon into the "home," and that prohibition was productive of corruption and hypocrisy.

Statistics gathered by an administration favorable to prohibition were presented to the voters, and a majority of voters decided that they would have no more of prohibition.

These statistics showed: That in twenty-seven of the large centres of Maine there were for years 900 saloons doing an open liquor business.

That when the State administration sent deputies to close up these saloons the sale of liquor was driven into private homes and has gone on there to a great extent.

That in 1909 there were 707 persons, both men and women, committed for running saloons, "kitch-

en bars," or otherwise selling liquor.

That in the same year 3,009 persons were committed for intoxication.

That these arrests were only a fraction of the total extent of liquor selling and intoxication, and that a large proportion of the arrests for liquor selling were of those selling liquor in private homes.

That of the total of 6,046 persons committed to jail in 1909 for all offenses, not less than one-half, or 3,069 were sentenced for intoxication.

That nearly all the liquor sold was the worst kind of whiskey, brandy and gin, adulterated and misbranded and often poisoned.

The records of the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine proved this.

That there are eighteen express companies organized and run for the sole purpose of transporting and selling whiskey.

That enormous quantities of liquor came into the State by express and freight. In the city of Portland, from 600 to 800 gallons of whiskey arrived by freight every morning, and even in cities of only 1,500 inhabitants fifty quarts of whiskey came by express every day.

That the rural regions were likewise filled with liquor selling by "pocket peddlers," the ordering of liquor by express and an enormous consumption of hard cider.

That there was scarcely a drug store in the State which did not sell liquor. Of the total number of arrests a considerable proportion were those of druggists.

That the cocaine, morphine and opium habits had spread to an appalling extent. The records of the chiefs of police showed this conclusively.

That 12.8 per cent. of the whole number of divorce decrees were granted on specific grounds of intoxication; that of the 28.6 per

cent. of divorces granted on grounds of cruel and abusive treatment, a large number were directly traceable to intoxication, as also a large proportion of the 4.4 per cent. granted on the ground of non-support.

That a large proportion of the inmates of the State insane asylums were alcoholics or were suffering from derangement indirectly caused by excess of alcoholism.

These are some of the facts that influenced the majority of Maine's voters to vote for an administration which is pledged to resubmit the whole prohibition question to the people and repeal the obnoxious laws prevailing in Maine for more than fifty years.

REPEAL AND RESUBMISSION.

Portland, Me., Sept. 13.

With reference to his policy as Governor, Col. Frederick W. Plaisted said to-day:

"I have made no promise or pledge, except those made in the Democratic State platform, on which I stand squarely. They include the repeal of the Sturgis law and resubmission of the prohibition liquor law."

RAPS MAINE'S LIQUOR LAW.

Bar Harbor, Me., Sept. 1.

Rear Admiral Robley D. Evans (Fighting Bob), in an interview, has the following to say in regard to Maine's prohibitory law:

"I am reluctant to say anything of the laws of Maine. I do not want to talk about the laws of states other than my own without first making a thorough investigation and inquiry, but will say this honestly and fearlessly, and as one who is sure of his ground. I have had more trouble in the direction of my sailors getting drunk in the ports of Maine than I have had with my men while at any other ports in the world."

"I have gone ashore with a boatload of men in Portland, and when they returned to the boat in a surprisingly short time they did not know me. As far as the liquor question is concerned I would rather take my men anywhere in

the world than bring them to Maine."

"I do not believe in a prohibitory law unenforced, and I never have seen it enforced in Maine. I have found by experience that my men could always get whiskey in Maine. No, not whiskey, for it always was poison, and for the most part wood alcohol. I know that my men on short liberty would easily find the most impossible and abhorrent dives and there obtain their obnoxious concoctions, worse, much worse, than liquor. It made them always not so much drunk as crazy. I do not believe in a law that works like that."

"In New York my sailors go to places to get liquor, too. No law will stop them from looking for it, any more than the law of Maine has so far prohibited their finding it. Of course, they find it. It is not poison, but real whiskey; and if they are imposed upon in the quality of goods they know it on the instant and go where they can get what they want. I say that this condition is better than the condition in Maine."

"Theory aside, it requires a very short experience such as I had with my men and much shore liberty to demonstrate most practically and tellingly that oceans of intoxicating liquors are obtainable in Maine coast ports, and that the effect of this liquor on men is infinitely worse than is the effect of liquor obtained elsewhere."

MAINE VS. MISSOURI.

What Wm. Preston Hill, M. D., Ph. D., President of the Missouri Referendum League, has to say about it:

Two states have adopted the initiative and referendum in their constitutions in 1908, Maine and Missouri, and by a strange coincidence both states are using the initiative this year on the prohibition question, but here the similarity ends.

It is a startling fact that Maine, which has had the longest experience in prohibition of any state in the Union, is trying to get rid of it and adopt local option in its place

at the very time we are asked to abandon local option here and try the experiment of state-wide prohibition.

In view of this it may be well for us to find out the reasons that made state-wide prohibition unsatisfactory in Maine so as to profit by their experience.

When I campaigned for the referendum in that state I met the leaders of every description and the general consensus of opinion was that that it had been impossible to enforce the prohibition law where the local sentiment was largely against it.

The most intelligent temperance leaders admitted to me that it was a mistake to force prohibition on a community that was hostile to it; that to do so retarded the cause of temperance and was detrimental to its best interests.

That the failure of the law to be enforced created a condition far worse than the licensed saloon ever was. The saloon-keeper under license could be regulated and controlled by law; but the dive-keeper, under prohibition, conscious that he was a law-breaker, threw over-board every restraint and was ready to break every law.

The conditions in the large cities of Maine were appalling. Admiral Evans (Fighting Bob) publicly declared there was no place in the world where he dreaded so much to have his sailors go on shore as at Portland, Maine, under prohibition.

So it has been that the people of Maine have learned by actual, practical experience (which after all is the best teacher) that it was a mistake to try to legislate a general law for communities so widely dissimilar in every respect as their large cities and the rural counties.

For this reason they wish to adopt a local option law, so as to allow each community to determine for itself what is best suited to their local needs.

Their experience has been that where the local majority decrees prohibition, they also back up the law with a sound public opinion and provide the officials and the juries to enforce it.

But where prohibition is imposed by an outside authority, like the state, on a community that is hostile to it, then the local officials respond to the local sentiment and refuse to enforce the law; and we have an aggravation of the very evil we are trying to mitigate, with the addition of wholesale law violations. For this reason local option has been a success in this and other states and has proved a practical and satisfactory solution of the prohibition question; in fact,

the only system that has worked at all.

Personally, I never use intoxicants in any form and have always favored the cause of sobriety and temperance. I am therefore in a position to say that I view with alarm the proposition to abandon the safe and sound policy of local option to adopt the doubtful experiment of state-wide prohibition, at the very time when those who have had the most experience with it are discarding it.

Furthermore, local option is in line with true democracy. The people of each locality should have local self-government. It would be an outrage for the people of St. Louis to compel the people of Christian County to have saloons against their will. For the same reason, it is wrong for the people of Christian County to determine what is best for the people of St. Louis.

State-wide prohibition will not change the condition of the dry counties who have already determined what is best for them. It will simply enable the dry counties to impose their will on other communities without giving them the chance to determine that for themselves. It is, therefore a violation of the principles of self-government.

I have the highest regard for the ladies and gentlemen who have devoted their lives to the cause of temperance in this state. Many of them are my personal friends and I feel sure that they are actuated by the highest motives and the desire to uplift humanity; but my reason and experience tell me that their judgment is faulty on this occasion. Our difference is simply one of judgment, not of motives.

I am opposed to this prohibition amendment because I believe it will injure the cause of temperance and prove a detriment to the people of Missouri; that it is a backward step instead of a progressive one.

WILLIAM PRESTON HILL, M. D., St. Louis, Mo.

Sheriff's Sale.

By virtue and authority of a special execution issued from the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Iron County, Missouri, and to me the undersigned sheriff, directed, in favor of the State of Missouri, at the relation and to the use of J. N. Lewis, collector of the revenue of Iron County, Missouri, plaintiff, and against E. W. Graves, Fidelity Title and Trust Company, a Corporation, Trustee, succeeding Charles E. Speer, surviving Trustee under the will of William K. Nimick, deceased; James J. Donnell, surviving Trustee of the estate of Alexander Nimick and others, formerly partners as Nimick and Company; Robert R. Singer and

Harriet I. Singer, his wife; George Singer, Laura T. S. Richardson, formerly Laura T. S. Singer and Charles A. Richardson, her husband; George Singer, Trustee for Mary E. Alderdice, formerly Mary E. Singer, wife of Winslow Alderdice; Mary Brunot, widow of H. J. Brunot, deceased; Hilary B. Brunot and Ann Elizabeth Brunot, his wife; Mary Caroline Klingensmith, formerly Mary Caroline Brunot, widow of Dr. P. Klingensmith; Hilary S. Brunot; Sarah Louise Brunot; Felix R. Brunot and Gertrude Brunot, his wife; Melasina B. Barclay, formerly Melasina B. Brunot, and Joseph K. Barclay, her husband; and John B. Brunot and Alice T. Brunot, his wife; and James T. Brunot, a minor, defendants.

defendants, bearing date September 22, 1910, and returnable to the October term, 1910, thereof, I have levied upon and seized the following described real estate and property, lying and being in Iron County, Missouri, as the property of said defendants, described as follows, to wit:

The east half of section thirteen, township thirty-one, range four east, and the south half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section thirteen, township thirty-one, range four east; also the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section twelve, township thirty-one, range four east; also the north half of the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and all the southwest quarter—all in section twenty-four, township thirty-one, range four east; also, lot one of the northeast quarter, and the southeast quarter—all in section two, township thirty, range three east; also the west half of the southeast quarter, and the west half of the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter, range three east; all of the above described land being situated in Iron County, Missouri.

And I will, on Tuesday, the 25th day of October, 1910, at the east front door of the courthouse, in the City of Ironton, Iron County, Missouri, between the hours of nine o'clock in the forenoon, and five o'clock in the afternoon of that day, and during the session of the circuit court, sell, at public vendue, all the right, title, claim, estate and property, of the said defendants, of, in and to the above described real estate and property, for cash in hand, to the highest bidder, to satisfy said execution and costs.

JOHN I. MARSHALL, Sheriff Iron County, Mo.

BOATMEN'S BANK

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Oldest Bank in the State of Missouri.

ORGANIZED 1847.

Capital	\$2,000,000.00
Surplus	1,000,000.00
Undivided Profits	709,393.24

INTEREST PAID ON TIME DEPOSITS:
3 Per Cent. for Six Months.
4 " " for Twelve Months.
Current Accounts, also, solicited.
WM. H. THOMPSON, Cashier.